DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 011 **EC 115 220**

AUTHOR	Zbinden, William R.; Martwick, Richard J.
TITLE	Accountability of Services.
PUB DATE	Apr 79
NOTE	31p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children (57th, Dallas, Texas, April 22-27, 1979, Session T-3)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Adjustment (to Environment); Communication Skills; *Contracts; Delivery Systems; *Educational Accountability; Educational Administration; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrichment; *Evaluation Methods; Guidance Counseling; *Handicapped Children; Motor Development; *Program Evaluation; Self Help Programs; Staff Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois (Chicago)

ABSTRACT

The project grant objectives for fiscal year 1978 for the Chicago Regional Project serving handicapped children are analyzed in relation to seven student related objectives and one facility staff related objective. Statistical data for objectives in the following areas are included: self help skills, motor development, communication skills, academic skills, adaptive/adjustment behaviors or Community Life Experiences, enrichment activities, guidance/management activities, and inservice workshop activities. Reported among the problems identified are that a different approach is needed to compare and contrast needs assessment with service delivery, an either-or decision must be made which does not account for all services rendered because some individual service contract objectives cut across more than one project grant objective, and higher standards of expectations and refinement of service contract writing need to be emphasized. (SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED1710111

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

57th
Annual International Convention
Council for Exceptional Children

Session T3

Service Contract System
"Administrative Management Tool for Optimum Service Delivery"

ACCOUNTABILITY OF SERVICES

by

William R. Zbinden
Executive Director

Richard J. Martwick
Administrative Agent

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CEC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC115220

Educational Service Region
of Cook County
Richard J. Martwick
Superintendent

Chicago Regional Project
ESEA Title I 89-313
William R. Zbinden
Executive Director

ACCOUNTABILITY OF SERVICES
VIA
SERVICE CONTRACT SYSTEM

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language defines "accountable" as "answerable, or capable of being explained". "Account" is defined as a "narative or record of events; a precise list or enumeration". For educational purposes, the concept of accountability carries a connotation of responsibility, and being able to answer or provide an accurate and complete listing of services rendered for dollars expended. Ideally, it should go further in teasing out the specific effects of the specific programs or supplemental intervention. Practically, we all know some of the multitude of problems associated with controlling significant variables in the classroom teacher/learner environment.

The Proposed Rules for Title I, published February 7, 1979 in Volume 44, Number 27 of the Federal Register are advocating or requiring the ideal type of accountability. The three models offered, i.e., the Norm-Reference, the Comparison Group and the Specific Regression Model are research oriented, complicated and subject to significant error variance and interpretation difficulties. The conversion of scores to a common reporting metric, although a laudable effort, introduces more potential problems. For our purposes, the best evidence is simply, "Did you do what you said you were going to do in your grant application?"

The Title I Rules and Regulations", project application requirements, require a needs assessment on each individual eligible handicapped child identified and counted. The tabulation and analysis of the Needs Assessments are used to establish the grant application objectives. For FY 78 the following seven (7) student related objectives and one (1) facility staff related objective and data

follow for discussion. During the year, on a quarterly basis, the individual service contracts completed to date are tabulated and classified according to the project grant objectives. An analysis of the service contracts in relation to the grant objectives becomes the basis for the external evaluation team's assessment of the project's success and accountability.

[Insert Figure 1 here]

Figure 1 includes project grant objective number 1 for self help skills and the table used to tabulate service contracts written for self help. The table shows totals and divisional break-downs for numbers of contracts written, number of children served (duplication possible) and level of success achieved. It also shows the type of the pre-post test assessment devices used to determine which children were successful and which unsuccessful. As is consistent with the grant objective statements; checklists, video-tapes, informal, teacher-made and observations, pre and post, were made to determine service contract objectives for individual students. The other category was used where the pre-post test design did not fit the service contract evaluation format for success criterion.

As the table shows, twenty-two (22) service contracts were written for self-help skills during the year. Three hundred twenty-eight (328) children were served. This is an average of approximately fifteen (14.9) children per contract. Seventy-three (73%) percent of the contracts serving eighty-one (81%) percent of the children were in the Southern Division. Northern Division accounted for eighteen (18%) percent of the contracts written and seventeen (17%) percent of the children involved. Nine (9%) percent of the contracts serving two (2%) percent of the children involved

FIGURE 1

QUARTER: 1st 2nd 3rd (4th)

SELF-HELP SKILLS: By June 30, 1978, through a service contract format, the handicapped students will demonstrate the designated level of self-help skills as measured by one or more of the following instruments: checklists, videotape procedures, informal assessments, teacher-made tests, observations on a pre-post test basis. The criterion level is that 60 percent of the students will show the designated increase in the objectives set for them in the individual Facility Service Contract.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE # 1 SELF-HELP SKILLS 60 %

Division	Number of Contracts	Number of Children	Checklists Pre	Checklists Post	Video-Tape Pre	Video-Tape Post	Informal Pre	Informal Post	Teacher-Made Pre	Teacher-Made Post	Observation Pre	Observation Post	Other	Other	Criterion Level S ÷ T = C
NORTHERN	4	55	0	s 0 / u 0	0	s 0 / u 0	0	s 0 / u 0	0	s 0 / u 0	20	s 20 / u 0	35	s 35 / u 0	$\frac{55}{55}$ = 100%
CENTRAL	2	6	5	s 5 / u 0	0	s 0 / u 0	1	s 1 / u 0	0	s 0 / u 0	0	s 0 / u 0	0	s 0 / u 0	$\frac{6}{6}$ = 100%
SOUTHERN	16	267	93	s 80 / u 13	0	s 0 / u 0	0	s 0 / u 0	65	s 65 / u 0	103	s 103 / u 0	6	s 6 / u 0	$\frac{254}{267}$ = 95%
TOTAL	22	328	98	s 85 / u 13	0	s 0 / u 0	1	s 1 / u 0	65	s 65 / u 0	123	s 123 / u 0	41	s 41 / u 0	$\frac{315}{328}$ = 96%

Key: s = successful
u = unsuccessful
S = Sum successful
T = Total children involved
C = Criterion

were negotiated in the Central Division. Two-thirds (2/3) of the contracts were evaluated by either pre-post observations or checklists. The ninety-six (96%) percent level of student success far surpassed the sixty (60%) percent criterion level of success established in the grant objective.

Figure 2 includes project grant objective number 2 for Motor Development and the table again used to tabulate service contracts written in the areas of motor development.

[Insert Figure 2 here]

As can be seen from the figures, a total of sixty (60) contracts were written within this objective area during the year. A total of seven hundred sixty-eight (768) students (duplication possible) received motor development assistance. This is an average of approximately thirteen (12.8) children per contract. Central Division accounted for forty-eight (48%) percent of the contracts involving forty-eight (48%) of the students. Thirty-two (32%) percent of the contracts were written to serve thirty-three (33%) percent of the children involved in the Northern Division. Finally, twenty (20%) percent of the contracts involving eighteen (18%) percent of the students involved were from the Southern Division. Teacher-made, informal assessments and checklists were the major means of the student progress evaluation. The large number in the other category is accounted for mainly by physical and occupational therapist diagnostic and prescriptive planning for individual cases. Here, again, it is obvious from the final eighty-nine (89%) percent criterion level of success that the seventy (70%) percent grant objective level of success was surpassed.

FIGURE 2

QUARTER: 1st 2nd 3rd (4th)

MOTOR DEVELOPMENT: By June 30, 1978, through a service contract format, the handicapped students demonstrate the designated level of motor development as measured by one or more of the following instruments: checklists, videotape procedures, informal assessments, teacher-made tests, observations on a pre-post test basis. The criterion level is that 70 percent of the students will show the designated increase in the objectives set for them in the individual Facility Service Contract.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE # 2 MOTOR DEVELOPMENT 70

Division	Number of Contracts	Number of Children	Checklists Pre	Checklists Post	Video-Tape Pre	Video-Tape Post	Informal Pre	Informal Post	Teacher-Made Pre	Teacher-Made Post	Observation Pre	Observation Post	Other		Criterion Level S ÷ T = C
NORTHERN	19	258	27	s 17 / 10 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	60	s 60 / 0 u	134	s 129 / 5 u	12	s 12 / 0 u	25	s 25 / 0 u	$\frac{243}{258}$ = 94
CENTRAL	29	368	58	s 57 / 1 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	118	s 80 / 38 u	87	s 75 / 12 u	20	s 12 / 8 u	85	s 74 / 11 u	$\frac{298}{368}$ = 81
SOUTHERN	12	142	47	s 47 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	16	s 16 / 0 u	31	s 31 / 0 u	48	s 48 / 0 u	$\frac{142}{142}$ = 100
TOTAL	60	768	132	s 121 / 11 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	178	s 140 / 38 u	237	s 220 / 17 u	63	s 55 / 8 u	158	s 147 / 11 u	$\frac{683}{768}$ = 89

Key: s = successful
u = unsuccessful
S = Sum successful
T = Total children involved
C = Criterion

Figure 3 includes project grant objective number 3 covering communication skills and the table data used to tabulate the service contracts written in communication and language development.

[Insert Figure 3 here]

A total of forty-six (46) contracts involving six hundred seventy-five (675) children (duplication possible) in speech and/or language development were written. This is an average of approximately fifteen (14.7) students per contract. There was a fairly equal percentage of contracts and students involved across the three divisions. Central Division accounted for thirty-five (35%) percent of the contracts written involving forty-two (42%) percent of the students served. Northern Division wrote thirty-five (35%) percent of the contracts including thirty (30%) of the children involved. Thirty (30%) percent of the contracts involving twenty-eight (28%) percent of the students were from the Southern Division. The high number, 265, in the other evaluation category indicates the preponderance of diagnostic and prescriptive assistance requested and contracted. However, all types of evaluation were used including pre-post videotaping evaluations.

The initial grant objective had called for a sixty (60%) percent level of student success while a final total of ninety-seven (97%) percent was achieved.

FIGURE 3

QUARTER: 1st 2nd 3rd (4th)

COMMUNICATION SKILLS: By June 30, 1978, through a service contract format, the handicapped students will demonstrate the designated level of communication skills as measured by one or more of the following instruments: checklists, videotape procedures, informal assessments, teacher-made tests, observations on pre-post test basis. The criterion level is that 60 percent of the students will show the designated increase in the objectives set for them in the individual Facility Service Contract.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE # 3 COMMUNICATION SKILLS 60 %

Division	Number of Contracts	Number of Children	Checklists Pre	Checklists Post	Video-Tape Pre	Video-Tape Post	Informal Pre	Informal Post	Teacher-Made Pre	Teacher-Made Post	Observation Pre	Observation Post	Other	Criterion Level S + T = C
NORTHERN	16	206	64	s 64 / u 0	25	s 25 / u 0	0	s 0 / u 0	90	s 90 / u 0	0	s 0 / u 0	s 27 / u 0	$\frac{206}{206}$ = 100%
CENTRAL	16	282	11	s 7 / u 4	0	s 0 / u 0	46	s 46 / u 0	12	s 12 / u 0	0	s 0 / u 0	s 204 / u 9	$\frac{269}{282}$ = 95%
SOUTHERN	14	187	59	s 59 / u 0	32	s 32 / u 0	18	s 18 / u 0	17	s 17 / u 0	36	s 26 / u 10	s 25 / u 0	$\frac{177}{187}$ = 95%
TOTAL	46	675	134	s 130 / u 4	57	s 57 / u 0	64	s 64 / u 0	119	s 119 / u 0	36	s 26 / u 10	s 256 / u 9	$\frac{652}{675}$ = 97%

Key: s = successful
u = unsuccessful
S = Sum successful
T = Total children involved
C = Criterion

Figure 4 includes project grant objective number 4 covering academic skills and table data used to tabulate the service contracts written in academic or content subject matter areas of development.

[Insert Figure 4 here]

A total of seventy-eight (78) contracts were written during the year including nine-hundred seventy-two (972) students (duplication of students possible) This is an average of twelve and one-half (12½) students per contract. As can be seen, seventy-five (75%) percent of these contracts were written in the Northern and Central Division. Thirty-three (33%) percent of the contracts serving twenty-five (25%) percent of the involved students were from the Northern Division. Central Division accounted for forty-two (42%) percent of the contracts and fifty (50%) percent of the students involved. Twenty-four (24%) percent of the contracts and twenty-four (24%) percent of the involved students were from the Southern Division. This is consistent with the higher number of Self-Help contracts written in the Southern Division, thus tending to indicate lower functioning children in that division.

Teacher-made tests accounted for one-third (1/3) of the pre-post test assessment of success. Once again, the large number in the other category, 271, is accounted for mainly by requests for educational diagnostic assistance with individual children and individual educational program planning as a result of the academic diagnostic workups. Checklists and other informal evaluations were also frequently used. Observation and video-taping were least frequently used evaluation techniques for academic success.

Again, the ninety-four (94%) percent level of individual student contract success surpassed the grant objective criterion of seventy-five (75%) percent.

FIGURE 4

QUARTER: 1st 2nd 3rd (4th)

ACADEMIC SKILLS: By June 30, 1978, through a service contract format, the handicapped students will demonstrate the designated level of academic skills as measured by one or more of the following instruments: checklists, videotape procedures, informal assessments, teacher-made tests, observations on a pre-post test basis. The criterion level is that 75 percent of the students will show the designated increase in the objectives set for them in the individual Facility Service Contract.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE # 4 ACADEMIC SKILLS 75 %

Division	Number of Contracts	Number of Children	Checklists Pre	Checklists Post	Video-Tape Pre	Video-Tape Post	Informal Pre	Informal Post	Teacher-Made Pre	Teacher-Made Post	Observation Pre	Observation Post	Other	Other	Criterion Level S ÷ T = C
NORTHERN	26	246	83	s 83 / 0 u	11	s 8 / 3 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	106	s 105 / 1 u	41	s 41 / 0 u	5	s 5 / 0 u	$\frac{242}{246}$ = 98%
CENTRAL	33	489	53	s 47 / 6 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	98	s 69 / 29 u	108	s 101 / 7 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	232	s 223 / 9 u	$\frac{440}{491}$ = 90%
SOUTHERN	19	237	45	s 45 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	27	s 27 / 0 u	112	s 112 / 0 u	19	s 14 / 5 u	34	s 34 / 0 u	$\frac{232}{237}$ = 98%
TOTAL	78	972	181	s 175 / 6 u	11	s 8 / 3 u	125	s 96 / 29 u	326	s 318 / 8 u	60	s 55 / 5 u	271	s 262 / 9 u	$\frac{914}{972}$ = 94%

Key: s = successful
u = unsuccessful
S = Sum successful
T = Total children involved
C = Criterion

Figure 5 includes project grant objective number 5 covering adaptive/ adjustment behaviors or Community Life Experiences as it is sometimes called. The table data used to tabulate service contracts written in this area during the year are also provided.

[Insert Figure 5 here]

Notice that thirty-five (35) contracts were written involving six hundred sixty-nine (669) students (although duplication was possible. This is an average of approximately nineteen (19) students per contract. Over half the students involved were in the Southern Division. Only ten (10%) percent were from the Central Division while Northern Division accounted for thirty-five (35%) percent. Northern, Southern and Central Division accounted for forty (40%) percent, thirty-seven (37%) percent and twenty-three (23%) percent respectively. This reflects the larger number of students placed in the Northern and Southern Division for severe emotional disturbances. There are more and larger special facilities in these two divisions especially for severely emotionally disturbed children.

Over half (½) of the contracts were evaluated through the use of teacher-made tests, with observations and checklists on a pre-post basis following second and third respectively.

Of the six-hundred sixty-nine (669) students served, six hundred forty-five (645) or ninety-six (96%) percent meet the objectives established for them surpassing the grant objective criterion level established at sixty (60%) percent.

FIGURE 5

QUARTER: 1st 2nd 3rd (4th)

ADAPTIVE/ADJUSTMENT BEHAVIORS: By June 30, 1978, through a service contract format, the handicapped students will demonstrate the designated level of adaptive/adjustment behavior as measured by one or more of the following instruments: checklists, videotape procedures, informal assessments, teacher-made tests, observations on a pre-post test basis. The criterion level is that 60 percent of the students will show the designated increase in the objectives set for them in the individual Facility Service Contract.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE # 5 ADAPTIVE/ADJUSTMENT BEHAVIORS 60 %

Division	Number of Contracts	Number of Children	Checklists Pre	Checklists Post	Video-Tape Pre	Video-Tape Post	Informal Pre	Informal Post	Teacher-Made Pre	Teacher-Made Post	Observation Pre	Observation Post	Other		Criterion Level S ÷ T = C
NORTHERN	14	231	59	s 59 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	139	s 139 / 0 u	33	s 33 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	231/231 = 100%
CENTRAL	8	67	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	12	s 12 / 0 u	42	s 31 / 11 u	8	s 4 / 4 u	5	s 5 / 0 u	52/67 = 78%
SOUTHERN	13	371	51	s 42 / 9 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	175	s 175 / 0 u	83	s 83 / 0 u	62	s 62 / 0 u	362/371 = 98%
TOTAL	35	669	110	s 101 / 9 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	12	s 12 / 0 u	356	s 345 / 11 u	124	s 120 / 4 u	67	s 67 / 0 u	645/669 = 96%

Key: s = successful
u = unsuccessful
S = Sum successful
T = Total children involved
C = Criterion

Figure 6 includes project grant objective number 6 covering enrichment areas and the table data used to tabulate the service contracts written in the area of enrichment experiences.

(Insert Figure 6 here)

A total of forty-one (41) contracts were written serving fifteen hundred sixty-eight (1568) students (although duplication was possible). This averages thirty-eight (38) students per contract. Fifty-four (54%) percent of the contracts were written in the Northern Division, twenty-eight (28%) percent in the Southern Division and seventeen (17%) percent in the Central Division. In the same order Northern, Southern and Central Divisions accounted for fifty-four (54%) percent, twenty-eight (28%) percent and seventeen (17%) percent respectively. A majority of the enrichment contracts were written in the Northern Division as compared to the Southern and Central Divisions. Checklists, teacher-made tests and observations on a pre-post test basis accounted fairly equally for individual student evaluation of success.

Of the total fifteen hundred sixty-eight (1568) children involved, fourteen hundred forty-three (1443) children were successful and nine-two (92%) percent met the the service contract objectives established for them. This surpassed the grant objective criterion level of successful participation by ninety (90%) percent of the students involved.

FIGURE 6

QUARTER: 1st 2nd 3rd (4th)

ENRICHMENT AREAS: By June 30, 1978, through a service contract format, the handicapped students will be provided with enrichment experiences as measured by one or more of the following instruments: checklists, videotape procedures, informal assessments, teacher-made tests and/or teacher observations on a pre-post test basis. The criterion level is that 90 percent of the students will have participated in the enrichment exercises set for them in the Individual Facility Service Contract.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE # 6 ENRICHMENT AREAS 90

Division	Number of Contracts	Number of Children	Checklists Pre	Checklists Post	Video-Tape Pre	Video-Tape Post	Informal Pre	Informal Post	Teacher-Made Pre	Teacher-Made Post	Observation Pre	Observation Post	Other	Other	Criterion Level S + T = C
NORTHERN	22	852	430	s 430 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	395	s 395 / 0 u	27	s 15 / 12 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	$\frac{840}{852}$ = 99%
CENTRAL	6	274	156	s 119 / 37 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	118	s 118 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	$\frac{237}{274}$ = 86%
SOUTHERN	13	442	74	s 74 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	61	s 61 / 0 u	307	s 231 / 76 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	$\frac{366}{442}$ = 83%
TOTAL	41	1568	660	s 623 / 37 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	456	s 456 / 0 u	452	s 364 / 88 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	$\frac{1443}{1568}$ = 92%

Key: s = successful
u = unsuccessful
S = Sum successful
T = Total children involved
C = Criterion

Figure 7 includes project grant objective number 7 covering guidance/ management activities and the table data used to tabulate service contracts written in the areas of guidance and management.

(Insert Figure 7 here)

As the table indicates, thirty-seven (37) contracts were written which served four hundred twelve (412) students (although duplication was possible). The students per contract average was eleven (11). Southern Division accounted for forty-one (41%) percent of the contracts; Northern Division, forty-six (46%) percent and Central Division, fourteen (14%) percent. In similar manner, Southern, Northern and Central Divisions accounted for forty-four (44%) percent, thirty-four (34%) percent and twenty-two (22%) percent of the involved children respectively. Once again, this seems consistent with the higher number of severe emotionally disturbed children in the Northern and Southern Divisions.

Of the total four hundred twelve (412) students involved, three hundred ninety-three (393) were successful in accomplishing the service contract objectives established for them. Teacher-made tests, checklists and observations on a pre-post test basis were the basic means of contract evaluations.

FIGURE 7

QUARTER: 1st 2nd 3rd (4th)

GUIDANCE/MANAGEMENT: By June 30, 1978, through a service contract format, the handicapped students will demonstrate the designed level of self-management as measured by one or more of the following instruments: checklists, videotape procedures, informal assessments, teacher-made tests, observations on a pre-post test basis. The criterion level is that 65 percent of the students will show the designated increase in the objectives set for them in the individual Facility Service Contract.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE # 7 GUIDANCE/MANAGEMENT 65 %

Division	Number of Contracts	Number of Children	Checklists Pre	Checklists Post	Video-Tape Pre	Video-Tape Post	Informal Pre	Informal Post	Teacher-Made Pre	Teacher-Made Post	Observation Pre	Observation Post	Other	Other	Criterion Level S ÷ T = C
NORTHERN	17	140	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	43	s 43 / 0 u	68	s 68 / 0 u	29	s 29 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	$\frac{140}{140}$ = 100%
CENTRAL	5	92	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	5	s 2 / 3 u	87	s 81 / 6 u	$\frac{83}{92}$ = 90%
SOUTHERN	15	180	84	s 84 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	5	s 5 / 0 u	31	s 31 / 0 u	50	s 40 / 10 u	10	s 10 / 0 u	$\frac{170}{180}$ = 94%
TOTAL	37	412	84	s 84 / 0 u	0	s 0 / 0 u	48	s 48 / 0 u	99	s 99 / 0 u	84	s 71 / 13 u	97	s 91 / 6 u	$\frac{393}{412}$ = 95%

Key: s = successful
u = unsuccessful
S = Sum successful
T = Total children involved
C = Criterion

23

24

Figure 8 includes project grant objective number 8 plus the inservice workshop statistics conducted by the project's three (3) curriculum specialists. The table summarizes the data used to tabulate service contracts written in the areas of facility staff development and/or facility staff inservice. These would be considered indirect services to facility teachers as opposed to direct services to facility students in the preceding seven (7) objectives.

[Insert Figure 8 here]

As the table shows, there were a total of three hundred forty-five (345) contracts written involving service to two thousand five hundred four (2504) facility staff (although duplication was possible). Twenty-two (22%) percent of the contracts in the Northern Division served twenty-five (25%) percent of the facility staff involved. Central Division accounted for forty-five (45%) percent of the contracts written and thirty-eight (38%) percent of the facility staff involved. In Southern Division thirty-three (33%) percent of the contracts written accounting for thirty-seven (37%) percent of the facility staff served. Thus, there was a fairly equal balance of facility staff inservice provided to each division with a large amount of inservicing going on. The mean number of facility teachers per service contract was 7.3. The groups were held small for intensive purposes.

The rating scale techniques was by far the most frequently used method of staff service contract evaluations although a full contiuum of techniques was employed.

Of the total two thousand five hundred and four (2504) facility staff

inserviced, two thousand three hundred fifty-seven (2357) of the teachers met the service contract objectives set for them which resulted in a ninety-four (94%) percent total criterion level of success and surpassed the seventy-five (75%) percent level established in the grant objective.

FIGURE 8

QUARTER: 1st
2nd
3rd
(4th)

STAFF-RELATED: as provided by Educational Specialists - By June 30, 1978, after participation in service contracts in needs assessment areas, curriculum development, interpersonal skills, teaching strategies, preparation of classroom environment, development of Individualized Education Programs, etc., Facility Staff will increase their knowledge and/or skills as measured by one or more of the following instruments: checklists or rating scales or questionnaires or a pre-post design or other objective assessments. The criterion level is that 75 percent of the staff will show the designated increase in the objectives set for them in the individual Facility Service Contract.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE # 8 FACILITY STAFF RELATED/INSERVICE 75

Division	Total Contracts	Total Staff	Checklists Pre	Checklists Post	Rating Scale Pre	Rating Scale Post	Question-naire Pre	Question-naire Post	Teacher-Made Pre	Teacher-Made Post	Other Assessments Pre	Other Assessments Post	Other		Criterion Level S ÷ T = C
NORTHERN	76	623	0	s 0 / u 0	255	s 255 / u 0	109	s 109 / u 0	73	s 73 / u 0	115	s 111 / u 4	47	s 47 / u 0	595/623 = 96
CENTRAL	156	961	253	s 224 / u 29	380	s 376 / u 4	35	s 31 / u 4	41	s 38 / u 3	25	s 20 / u 5	226	s 174 / u 52	863/961 = 90
SOUTHERN	113	920	35	s 29 / u 6	406	s 393 / u 13	60	s 58 / u 2	149	s 138 / u 11	244	s 244 / u 0	43	s 37 / u 6	862/920 = 94
TOTAL	345	2504	288	s 253 / u 35	1041	s 1024 / u 17	204	s 198 / u 6	263	s 249 / u 14	384	s 375 / u 9	316	s 258 / u 58	2357/2504 = 94

Key: s = successful
u = unsuccessful
S = Sum successful
T = Total children involved
C = Criterion

37

Problem Areas

1. Although the priority needs assessed differed for the different handicapping conditions, the total city priority needs were from highest to lowest as follows:

Needs Assessment Priorities	Rank	%Contracts	Rank	%Students
1. Academic Areas	1	26.3	2	18.0
2. Guidance Management	5	12.4	6	7.6
3. Communication Skills	3	15.5	4	12.5
4. Motor Development	2	20.2	3	14.2
5. Adaptive/Adjustment Areas	6	11.8	5	12.4
6. Enrichment Areas	4	13.8	1	29.1
7. Self Help Skills	7	7.4	7	6.1

This data does not show a consistent matching of rank of priority needs with the percent of contracts written or percent of students involved. This is primarily the result of:

a. varying contract lengths,
b. varying number of students per contract,
c. contract objectives crossing more than one grant objective,
d. time lapse between needs assessment - service delivery, and
e. student mobility and staff turnover.

Thus, this type of comparison can be misleading.

A different approach is needed to compare and contrast needs assessment with service delivery in the future. Contracts need to be written more specifically. Contract time or teacher days and hours need to be taken into consideration.

2. Some of the individual service contract objectives cut across more than one project grant objective. A classic example is a service contract written to

provide exemplary direct services to children while at the same time inservicing the facility staff teacher to take responsibility for continuing the service upon termination of the service contract. Both direct and indirect services are being provided, so how should the contract be classified for tabulation under the grant objectives? An either-or decision must be made which does not account for all services rendered.

3. Since requests for diagnostic and individual educational programming (IEP) assistance could not be evaluated and classified on a pre-post test basis, two (2) new objectives were written into the FY 79 year grant application to include those service contracts.

4. Why were the project grant objective criteria so low in comparison to actual success achieved? The project grant objectives were set low for conservative purposes because there was no prior data upon which to estimate. Also, there was no way of predicting how the Title I personnel would be received in the facilities since they had no authority in them. The service contract objectives were also conservatively written to assure success. In the future, higher standards of expectations and refinement of service contract writing will be emphasized.

SUMMARY

If the first seven (7) objectives are considered to be direct student service and the eighth objective as indirect student service, a total of two hundred ninety-seven (297) direct service contracts were written as compared to three hundred forty-five (345) indirect service contracts. Thus, forty-six (46%) percent of the contracts were for direct service and fifty-four (54%) percent for indirect service. So, there was an equitable balance provided between direct and indirect supplemental assistance provided.

Putting the project grant objectives into a table format has helped to refine the service contract evaluation criteria. As a result, greater emphasis has been placed upon pre-planning of the pre-post test assessment.

The project has been accountable from a management point of view in doing what it said it was going to do. Needs assessment data were used to establish grant objectives which were fulfilled through a service contract management system. A clear audit trail is available for all supplemental services provided to each individual State supported facility, program within that facility, and individual student served.